Case: 4:19-cr-00740-RWS-JMB Doc. #: 27 Filed: 09/04/19 Page: 1 of 4 PageID #: 45

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of Missouri

United States of America	)		
v. MALIK ROSS	)	Case No.	4:19-MJ-6245 PLC
Defendant	)		

### ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Part I - Eligibility for Detention

Upon the
----------

- $\square$  Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or
- ₫ Motion of the Government or Court's own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

## Part II - Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

☐ A. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2) (previous violator): There is a rebuttable
presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person
and the community because the following conditions have been met:
$\square$ (1) the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):
☐ (a) a crime of violence, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C.
§ 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; or
$\Box$ (b) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; or
$\Box$ (c) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the
Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); or
$\Box$ (d) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs
(a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; or
$\Box$ (e) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves:
(i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921); (iii) any other dangerous weapon; or (iv) a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; and
☐ (2) the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C.
§ 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed; <i>and</i>
(3) the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was
committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; and
☐ (4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the
defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later

AO 472 (Re	v. 11/16)	Order of Detention	Pending Trial
------------	-----------	--------------------	---------------

✓ Lack of stable residence

 $\hfill \square$  Lack of financially responsible sureties

☐ B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3) (narcotics, firearm, other offenses): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the
defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses:
(1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the
Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508);
(2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;
☐ (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;
☐ (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; or
☐ (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245,
2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.
☐ C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above
☐ The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above, and detention is ordered on that basis. (Part III need not be completed.)
OR
☐ The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.
Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention
After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:
By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required.
In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:
✓ Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong
✓ Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted
☐ Prior criminal history
☐ Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision
☐ History of violence or use of weapons
☐ History of alcohol or substance abuse
✓ Lack of stable employment

Case: 4:19-cr-00740-RWS-JMB Doc. #: 27 Filed: 09/04/19 Page: 3 of 4 PageID #: 47 AO 472 (Rev. 11/16) Order of Detention Pending Trial Lack of significant community or family ties to this district ☐ Significant family or other ties outside the United States ☐ Lack of legal status in the United States ☐ Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration ✓ Prior failure to appear in court as ordered ☐ Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement Use of alias(es) or false documents Background information unknown or unverified Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION: The Government charged Defendant with violation of 18 U.S.C. § 656 (embezzle, purloin and misapply United States currency). The Government moved for Defendant's detention on the grounds of: (1) flight risk; and (2) serious danger to the community posed by Defendant's release, in light of an admission that he fired a gunshot that killed a seven year-old child on August 12, 2019. The Court held a hearing. Defendant appeared with counsel. The Government appeared through an assistant United States Attorney. Prior to the hearing, the Court provided the parties with access to the Pretrial Services Report. Neither party sought to amend the Report. The Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. The Pretrial Services officer recommended release. At the hearing, the Government proffered the following in support of detention: The Government adduced testimony from a St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department detective regarding the circumstances of the alleged crime and a shooting the previous day that resulted in death of a seven year-old. The detective stated that in an interrogation, Defendant admitted that he took \$50,000 in funds entrusted to his employer and that he took the funds with the assistance of his aunt to facilitate flight from the St. Louis area. The detective also testified that Defendant admitted to shooting into a crowd of people on August 12, 2019. The police recovered at least 10 shell casings from the same weapon at the shooting scene. Defense counsel offered the following in support of release: Defense counsel cross-examined the detective and established that the underlying charge is not a crime of violence. The detective also acknowledged that Defendant stated he was not trying to hurt anyone. The detective recalled that Defendant stated that he was innocent and a good person. Defense counsel also noted that Defendant has no prior arrests or convictions. Defendant has a place to live and is a high school graduate. Defense counsel emphasized that Defendant did not confess to murder. CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

#### Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Patria L. 09/04/2019 Date:

United States Magistrate Judge

Page 4 of 4

MALIK ROSS 4:19-MJ-6245 PLC

The Pretrial Services Report provides the following additional relevant information: Defendant is twenty-three years old. He has been living with his grandmother. Pretrial Services was unable to speak to Defendant's grandmother. Defendant has limited contact with his thirty-six year old mother. However, the Pretrial Services officer spoke with Defendant's mother and she stated that Defendant was permitted to live with her and two other children if released. The Report also establishes that Defendant graduated from high school and had been employed at Garda, the victim in the alleged underlying crime. The Report also notes that Defendant receives Social Security disability and his mother is the payee. Defendant has several outstanding warrants in traffic-related cases and a history of failing to appear in traffic cases. Aside from the arrests in connection with the August 12, 2019 shooting, Defendant has no felony arrest record or history of convictions.

Based on the evidence adduced at the hearing, the arguments of counsel, and the information contained in the Pretrial Services Report, the Court concludes that the Government proved by clear and convincing evidence that Defendant is a threat to the community and a flight risk, and no conditions or combination of conditions will assure his appearance or the safety of the community. Accordingly, the Court grants the Government's motion for pretrial detention.